

United States District Court, Eastern District of Washington
Magistrate Judge Mary K. Dimke
Yakima

USA v. CHARLIE JIM PETERS **Case No. 1:20-CR-2046-SAB-1**

Video Conference
The Defendant agreed to appear via video conference.

Detention Hearing:

01/06/2021

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Pam Howard, Courtroom Deputy [Y] | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Michael Murphy, US Atty (video) |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Erica Helms, US Probation / Pretrial Services (tele) | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Jennifer Barnes, Defense Atty (video) |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Defendant present <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> in custody USM appearing by video from Yakima County Jail | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Interpreter NOT REQUIRED |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Defendant continued detained | <input type="checkbox"/> Defendant not present / failed to appear |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> Conditions of Release imposed |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> 199C Advice of Penalties/Sanctions |

REMARKS

Due the current COVID-19 public health crises, all parties including Defendant, appeared by video or teleconference.

USA advised this charge carries a presumption of detention. USA argued why the Court should detain the Defendant and why there are no conditions of release which will reasonably assure Defendant's appearance as required and/or the safety of the community. USA argues Defendant does not have a stable residence, has a criminal history, and the weight of the evidence is strong. USA reports the victim and victim's family have reported receiving threats from Defendant.

Court colloquy with USA regarding the alleged threats and agent's communications with Defendant.

Defense counsel argued Defendant can live with his parents, no minors live in the home, and they could provide Defendant transportation to court appearances. Defense argues Defendant has long term ties to the community, most of Defendant's criminal history is related to substance abuse and he would be willing to participate in treatment.

USA advised the Court a protection order should be entered to protect the victim's physical address from Defendant.

The Court ordered:

1. USA's Motion for Detention is **granted**.
2. That there is no combination of conditions to assure the Defendant's appearance as required or conditions to ensure that Defendant is not a danger to the community.
3. Defendant shall be detained by the U.S. Marshal until further order of the Court.

The Court enters an oral protection order Defense is to NOT release victim's address contained within the email sent to the parties by U. S. Pretrial Services.